

APPROVED MINUTES OF AQUACULTURE TASKFORCE MEETING

September 4, 2003

Darling Center, Walpole, Maine

Task Force Attendees

Jim Salisbury
Josie Quintrell
Van Perry
Don Perkins
Will Hopkins
Anne Hayden
Paul Frinsko
Des Fitzgerald
Jim Dow
Brian Beal
Paul Anderson

Stakeholder Advisory Panel Attendees

Chris Hamilton
Carolyn Manson
Roger Fleming
David Schmanska
Sebastian Belle
Eric Horne

Staff

Bruce Stedman
David Etnier
Kathleen Leyden
Sue Inches
Andrew Fisk
John Sowles

“Virtual” Boat tour – 8:30 – 10:00 am

Tour was postponed due to weather.
Speakers presented in Brooke Hall

Eric Horne, SAP

- Reviewed history of starting his operation and operating leases in Maine.
(Paper submitted)

Dave Schmanska, SAP

- Described his history with the issue and the nature of his work on changing notification requirements for leases. He will present a summary position for municipalities and harbormasters in the near future.

Paul Bryant, Damariscotta Harbormaster

- Recounted when issues arise during the public hearing process, where navigation and sport fishing are principal concerns of the public.

Mark Desmeules, Damariscotta River Association

- Reviewed work of DRA and involvement of shellfish growers in their work.

Questions were asked of Eric Horne regarding specifics on how they operated leases, where potential lease sites could be located, regulations and leasing, marketing, and business operations, how much time and money it would take to obtain a lease today given present state of controversy.

Questions were asked of Dave Schmanska and Paul Bryant about their work responsibilities generally, notification of towns of lease applications, whether a town needed to notify riparians about issuance of moorings, whether moorings were allocated according to a plan, whether towns have limits on the amount of moorings set by the State, whether they keep records of complaints and whether year-round residents or seasonal residents are typical.

Questions were asked of Mark Desmeules about DRA's perspective on how lease siting works or doesn't work, conflicts between leases and conserved lands, what DRA would do if presented with a position that a lease does conflict with a piece of conserved land, whether they testified on behalf of shellfish growers, whether they are considering carrying capacity of the estuary, staffing and legal status of the organization, whether fishers or growers are members.

Followup

Legal interpretation of extent of municipal jurisdiction in State waters for the issuance of mooring permits. This is anticipated for further discussion at 10/16 meeting.

10:00 – 12:00 Review of Meeting Minutes, Objectives, Activities, and Agenda

- Opening remarks / logistics reviewed by Bruce Stedman
- Welcome and thanks by Paul Anderson
- Approval of minutes (Hayden / Beal) – unanimous
- Vice-chair
 Josie Quintrell nominated (Anderson / Hayden) – unanimous

- Review criteria for success
 - Keep the vision statement being developed at the forefront
 - Focus on the fact that you are making recommendations / legislation
 - Use a beginner's mind even though you are experts
 - Allow for inventing without committing
 - Active engagement
 - Seek advice from SAP & staff
 - Maintain relationships
 - Keep an active parking lot (Dow)

Make sure that we keep all state and federal agencies involved that have some jurisdiction – including DEP and feds (Perkins)

Make sure we have credibility with Legislature (Frinsko)
- Report from SAP concerning meeting #1

Reviewed Rob Bauer's concerns expressed via email. Chair and Legislators have contacted Rob regarding his interest in further participation. TF is interested in having him continue to participate, but his position should be filled if he does not want to actively participate as that sector is needed. The Legislature should handle this directly.

Update on commercial fishing vacancy (Etnier). This is still pending, but nominations have been made to the Speaker. David Turner has been nominated and accepted for the commercial fishing vacancy.
- Email distribution

Chair will send emails he receives with general public comment to Deirdre Gilbert who will work to make them available on the website. Similarly email received at marine.aqua@maine.gov will be posted at the website in order for TF members to receive it.

Email will not be screened or filtered by staff.

We will develop an autoreply to the email postings that say email will be posted on the website, in order to get out of a "penpal" situation.
- Meeting schedule
 - 9/25-26 meeting in Blue Hill
 - Public meeting 7:00 pm – 9:30 pm
 - Boat trip mechanics discussed by staff and SAP Hamilton
 - Visual impact presentation 9/25 at 5:00 pm; boat tour following day
 - 10/16 meeting in Rockland
 - Include regulatory review / assessment at this meeting to start developing recommendations (Perkins)

Have SAP review interim draft of economic impact study (Dow)
Make sure it is available as early as possible prior to meeting with TF
(Perkins)
Perhaps have the final report done by November 6 (Perry)

11/6 meeting in Portland

11/20 meeting in Lubec

12/11-12 meeting in Brunswick – CHANGE to 12/4-5

12/22 meeting in Belfast – CHANGE to 12/18

Public meetings in Blue Hill, Rockland, Lubec, and Brunswick

- Review of Agenda (Stedman)
- Public notice of meetings (Anderson)
Staff will place paid display ads in newspapers for public meetings, and continue to do email notification of meetings to interested parties prior. Meeting schedule will be posted on the web site.

Afternoon Session, 1:00PM

Roger Fleming, Conservation Law Foundation

Bay Management Coalition: Ad hoc group that came together during last legislative session. Members: Vivian Newman, Sally McCloskey (EPBEA), Steve Perrin, Sally Littlefield (Innkeeper), Dick Davis (Sorrento)

Q. How do you balance state and local interests? Which would take precedence in the final analysis?

A. There needs to be a consistency between the two, state proposals must comply with local plan...variances possible, a regular process of adapting to each other.

Q. Would there have to be state and local approval of new aquaculture developments?

A. Approval of DMR would be sent to the local planning body for them to sign off. A siting structure would still be in place.

Q. Municipal shellfish management is an example where there is a local ordinance, based on state standards...zoning leaves a bad taste...how would you implement the bay management plan? How do you attract and pay for technical resources needed? How do you get communities (already overburdened with requirements and some only have part time offices)

A. This isn't zoning, there would be no lines drawn in the bay. But exclusion "zones" around sensitive areas could be part of it. Creation of plans takes time and resources. Each local plan could look quite different, based on what local

communities want to do. “Communities” is broader than just municipalities...could include many stakeholders who care about the local waters. Grant funding could be available to cover some of the costs.

Q. What is the extent of the jurisdiction that you are thinking of? Do you envision fisheries management being a part of this?

A. Need to create a couple of pilot projects to determine this. This is a tool that could be used out to the 3-mile limit. Bay management could/should apply to all uses of the waters out to 3 miles.

Q. Des—I wish we had Bay Management now. How long would it take to get BM up and running?

A. Taunton Bay---could be up and running in a couple of years. Bigger bays will take longer.

Q. What would you do with new leases applications while Bay M. is getting up to speed?

A. Improve the process so people’s issues get out on the table. One of the big benefits of BM is to get people who have different views talking to each other. We could start doing this now.

Q. Will—This plan is a “pencil sketch on a napkin” and he is concerned that BM will be too narrowly focused on aquaculture and not include biological, social and other issues. The BM concept ignores the carrying capacity of the community. Lubec example—the town doesn’t have the resources to do BM. Concern about overworked and underfinanced communities—especially in rural areas. Defining “community” more broadly and providing resources to communities and the agencies that work with them would have to be done for BM to succeed.

Panel Members:

Sally Littlefield: Innkeeper from the mid-west, with husband tripled growth of business in 10 years, have learned what draws people to their inn. Key words: “spectacular views”, peaceful, natural beauty, etc.” Heavy recreational use of the coast in the area.

Steve Perrin, Friends of Taunton Bay: Writes picture books about Maine coast. World population has tripled, planet and resources have stayed the same or declined. Marine creatures are disenfranchised...and we’re making decisions about their lives without knowing much at all about them. Aquaculture Vision is too narrow, because its driven by industries that make money by harvesting protein from the sea. We need a fundamental re-vision...what about the ecosystem that supports us? That’s the root cause. Broader vision should include research, ecology, etc. Then, how does the vision get implemented. Friends of Taunton Bay is drafting its own Bay Plan.

Q. What principles will you use to guide your planning effort?

A. We are innovative and will get the cumulative knowledge of all the stakeholders who know that Bay. Broad input from a large constituency will help us with this enormous task.

Q. Who are the “Friends of Taunton Bay”? How many members and where are they from?

A. Taunton Bay is bounded by 3 towns. We have membership from those towns, from Ellsworth, from away. We have 344 members. We started because of aquaculture...there was a stealth operation to keep local people from knowing this was coming. No local input. This created a mission for them to prevent further degradation from any and all sources...shoreland development is one of these...nitrogen from development pollutes the bay...we are part of the problem. Applying for 501©3 status.

Sally McCloskey: EPBEA. We realized that we were reacting to finfish aquaculture and struggling with the current system. Wanted to be pro-active. End of 2001 went to DMR and wanted to look at lease laws in a different way. Talked to Ted Ames about lobster zone councils. We are looking at Bay Management and would support a plan. Also working on Holtra-Chem and mercury discharges, impacts on clams. Bay Management could be modeled after school committee model, planning board model. Could have a Baykeeper as an enforcement officer, paid Director, volunteer staff.

Vivian Newman, Chairs Maine Chapter of Sierra Club, 4300 members in Maine. Came to aquaculture issue through attending a hearing and seeing frustration of local people who didn't understand the process. Showed up at informational session, but not the hearing. Local people didn't testify at hearing, because the process was too complex for people to grasp. Tyranny of small decisions...decisions made based on immediate concerns and not in context. The broader context was lacking, which could lead to too much aquaculture. Sierra Club values: participation, protection of natural resources. Have to get started on Bay Management, even though many questions to be answered.

Dick Davis: From Sorrento, retired dentist from New Jersey, small boat sailing is his passion. Races sailboats. Mussel raft proposed for starting line of sailboat races. It's a forgone conclusion that the lease will go through...if you're not a fisherman, you don't have much of a voice in the decision. Can't race in Lamoine anymore, too many rafts there. Worries that Frenchman's Bay will be filled with rafts eventually. The process has not been fair.

Q. (Ann) Ultimate goal of some groups like yours is to get rid of aquaculture all together. What percentage of the opposition to aquaculture is this? Are we (TF)

going to do all this work only to be taken to court? (Josie) What percentage are opposed to finfish versus shellfish?

A. McCloskey---referring to Marsden Brewer's scallop project...is in favor of that. Finfish is another story.

A. Perrin---maybe 5% would totally oppose aquaculture. We are opposed to non-native species being put in our Bay, however.

A. Davies---hope to have a submerged type of mussel platform. We can then sail (over them??)

Q (Jim Salisbury)—What is it about finfish aquaculture that is unacceptable?

A. Littlefield—landowners have no say, but we want no finfish sites in our view, its an intrusion, pollution, noise, industrialization of a pristine, unspoiled area

A. Fleming—we would say the % opposed to aquaculture is very low, although finfish have more issues—scale, pollution, technological improvements that industry can make will help, though

Q. Steadman—trying to move discussion on. Salisbury wanting to spend the time to find out what this panel really thinks.

A. Littlefield—our area isn't compatible with finfish aquaculture because of water flushing issues. Each Bay has its own characteristics and constraints.

A. Newman—very concerned about habitat, would not draw lines beyond ecological boundaries (?)

Q. Des---would you invite membership from the aquaculture industry? Or do you not consider them a viable stakeholder?

A. Fleming---depends on where and when the discussion is taking place.

A. Perrin—People would be shortsighted if they did not invite industry to participate. Also, we have land-based aquaculture at the Franklin facility that includes integration of various species in an aquaculture system.

Steadman—trying to refocus the group to TF learning and issues

Q. Don Perkins---Where does the group want to go on BM issue?

Q. Josie---We tend to jump to solutions. BM is one solution. We need to develop a framework of what the problems are and then develop the possible solutions. We need to step back now, there are a number of solutions.

Q. Ann—I don't think this is an either/or issue. We could use shellfish management approach, versus telling towns they have to come up with a plan, telling them that they can come up with a plan.

Q. Paul A---Cellphone tower example: if we have too many towers, do we need to solve it with a BM plan?...BM should encompass as many issues as possible, not just one issue—aquaculture. We are trying to hit a smaller issue with a sledgehammer.

Q. Jim Dow—BM is huge. Look at Comp Planning. Has that been successful? BM could be an idea worthy of trying, but we shouldn't put all our hopes in it. Instead, we should try to address some of the specific and immediate issues that people have brought up—such as local disenfranchisement in the lease process.

Q. Ann—we can't address everything. But we can pick something to work on—like the issues brought up today.

Advisory Panel Questions for Panel:

Q. Dave Schmanska---what would contribute to “aquaculture exclusion areas”, what criteria would you use?

A. McCloskey—Conservation easements would be a criteria.

A. Fleming---community interests would be considered

Q. Van---Eric Horne spoke of locating in 9 sites and only one was viable for business...can't just pick an area and hope that it will work.

Q. Brian Beal---A major different between clam program and BM is that towns without shellfish ordinances still have open clam flats....Sees BM as a method for excluding aquaculture...

Name tent cards should be printed on both sides so audience members can see names

Q. Beal---Would like a working definition of ecology.

Q. Des—State guidelines for BM, is that what we need?

A. Ann—Yes, and there may be bays that aren't appropriate for aquaculture. Zoning or BM can be adaptive, not permanent.

A. Ann---ecosystem management is what we think happens in the environment, its about managing people.

A. Don---troubled by BM, because its being thought of in too narrow a way. Irish BM is just aquaculturists talking to each other, which they should do, but isn't a wholeistic approach to managing the resources. We're dealing with a question of property rights. The real question is how is the state distributing property rights? We should focus on addressing the specific concerns that people are raising. BM is a long term—25-50 year process that we can't deal effectively with now.

Q. Des---the buy-in at the local level is the appeal of BM. This is very important. Fear is the time and resources it would take. Fear of creating another layer of bureaucracy...making it tougher for industry to do business.

A---prototype models are very helpful. Organizations like those here today will advance the thinking, and there has to be a mechanism for welcoming this and taking it in. At the same time, it needs a lot more time to develop these ideas.

A—Jim Dow---TF should make a recommendation on BM, that it's a worthy idea to be explored.

Parting words from panel:

Perrin: DMR coming down and controlling your area with a procedure that doesn't take your concerns into consideration. We're here because of this fear. BM need authority for their work. State walks over us and we need a recommendation to the legislature that would address this.

McCloskey: I hope you (TF) will seize this opportunity and deal with it. Tell SPO what we heard and have them put something together that local groups can look at. Maine can lead the way in managing resources.

Carrying Capacity Discussion---3:15 PM

Chris Davis—Great Eastern Mussel---“local effects” on ecosystem are studied, but baywide scale effects aren't measurable, social and navigation issues will have more impact than ecological effects. Could see “bay management” like lobster zones, industry getting together to agree on best management practices

Neal Pettigrew---described study on PEI where mussels were undersized because the nutrients were used up in the waters

Eric Horne—you can see great differences farm to farm based on different densities of stocking

Neal---lots of variability within a bay, discusses various methods of measuring viability of sites for aquaculture.

Q—Paul A---what's the appropriate scale for measuring these things? Studies take several years, so its too long for lease process. Cruder studies could be done ahead of time, but we don't have time to do studies for every lease.

Mary Jane Perry—showed time series of phytoplankton concentration off of Darling Center dock. There's a scale issue—the space that you measure, the time that you measure. “Env. Integrity” and “resilience”: need to understand the natural variability including harmful algal blooms, space and time scales. Could we predict the ecosystem outcomes from an aquaculture site? At some point, the system will react to aquaculture in a non-linear way. We don't know exactly where that point is. Can we link educational observations---high school data collection—to scientific work? How can we use information that is out there---European experience, DMR data, etc.

Q.—Josie---What about seasonal algal blooms?

A.Has to do with light, can happen almost any time of year.

Larry Mayer---oysters in Damariscotta aren't taking up much of the phytoplankton here...we have orders of magnitude greater variability in wild populations...shellfish in San Francisco Bay take up 50% of the water in filter feeding. Carrying capacity is a macro measurement. Carrying capacity of individual leasesites is a micro measurement. Much smaller scale modeling would be needed to monitor lease sites. We don't have data that can show the effects of aquaculture.

Q. Ability of an embayment to absorb pollutants—finfish example? Do we need to study this now? Are we getting close to carrying capacity of Cobscook Bay?

A. More problems at the local level—the cove level—than with larger systems. Large systems in Maine are not even close to hypoxia. But at high fish densities, you can see effects on a cove—not unlike a school of pogies coming in.

A. Can't get away with considering sites as single entities for long. Finfish sites can have a large impact, but the fact that the waste spreads out into the bay dilutes it. Low flushing areas are more likely to have problems.

A. John Sowles---our approach is continuous monitoring. In Blue Hill Bay we were concerned that another finfish facility could push the condition of the water over the edge. We aren't doing continuous monitoring of shellfish sites.

Q. Don—cost of doing baseline oceanographic model of Penn Bay? Damariscotta River? At the cove level?

A. Neal---\$100k per year to do models and field data for one bay area. Cost includes getting model started and buying new equipment. Higher resolution model

as a subset of larger model, less cost is involved. If you don't have underlying model, then the cost is much more.

A. Cost depends on how specific the questions are....cheap studies can be done just to check impact of one raft. Save a lot of \$\$ by being very specific.

Q. Brian—what's the impact of lobster bait, compared to aquaculture impacts.

A. John Sowles—did not see a significant impact of lobster bait

A. Larry---lobster is probably more impactful than sewage

Q.-Josie—Does the DMR do any broad ecosystem monitoring?

A. No—the farther afield from aquaculture site, the more variables there are and separating out the aquaculture effects from other variables becomes a problem. New MeDES permits require monitoring at sensitive areas of the coast. “Sensitive” areas are defined as the less flushed areas, Schoodic west is the general area. A large shellfish raft in small embayment could have more impact than a small fish facility in the same area. This is the scale issue. Doesn't buy that certain areas “aren't appropriate” for aquaculture, because it depends on scale of the operation and physical characteristics of the bay.

Cobscook Bay---10% of nutrients are a result of aquaculture, 90% from natural water flow. Does that load cause an unacceptable change? How is “acceptable” defined---oxygen depletion, species decline, etc. Where do you draw the line on what's unacceptable? Cobscook has been re-sampled during fallowing and with fish. There were high nutrient levels even when there weren't fish in the pens.

Q. New DEP permit will require continuous monitoring of nutrients, chlorophyll, oxygen, in Cobscook Bay.

Q. Given the variability, how can you monitor?

A. John---got tired of reacting to each dredging project and so forth. State needs to identify the variability statewide, so we have a baseline. A monitoring program couldn't stand the test of scrutiny without this. A monitoring program has to be done right to mean anything.

A. Mary Jane---Well placed moorings could work and these could be relatively inexpensive.

Q. Sebastian---growers have a strong interest in carrying capacity and will cooperate on research. They are interested in measurement tools that could or should be used in the regulatory process. They are concerned that models are not sufficiently along to be used in a regulatory setting. Would the panel have enough

confidence in models that you would be willing to risk your position at the University based on them?

A. It depends on how you want to use the models...some extrapolations are hard to measure or prove. Some aspects of this the scientists are very comfortable with, others they are not. Food supply is pretty consistent. However, non-linear effects are the ones that are hard to predict. We are uncomfortable predicting disease...does density increase the probability of disease.

Q. Inter-relationships between finfish and shellfish sites...?

A. Scallops on finfish sites was one study....and growth rates appeared to improve. They're doing "integrated aquaculture" in Canada...how many mussel rafts would it take to neutralize salmon farms?

Q. Coastal development causes nutrient loading in western part of the state. Has coastal development impacted aquaculture? Is this measured?

A. We (DMR) have measured nutrient loading through monitoring data. We don't use models.

Q.---Don P---What about other areas of the world where aquaculture is a larger industry? Have they measured non-linear effects?

A. Mary Jane---Not that she knows of.

A.---Larry---"non-linear" is being used here as meaning non-linear mathematical relationships and also as meaning "unintended consequences", which are impossible to predict.

4:30 – 5:15

- Deliberations on future directions – existing regulatory framework v. bay management?

Beal – bay management is bigger than aquaculture and so beyond this group's work. It is too complicated, review the existing regulatory framework.

Hopkins – I would like to continue an organic process that considers all the issues, I am not so afraid of moving toward something called bay management. We will need to wrestle with local control and community involvement, which may not be bay management but area management. We can move toward this slowly.

Perkins – Using current regulatory framework as backbone does not preclude bay management. It is not an issue of fear, we are able to look at tough policy

questions from our experience. A regional focus may be needed. Vision statement is fundamental to our work. We need to be careful that bay management is designed to solve the problems we are hearing about people feeling disenfranchised. We can brainstorm today on the range of problems to be fixed.

Perry – I would like to reiterate Anne's remark about setting forth state criteria for all encompassing plans so that aquaculture was not excluded.

Anderson – The Resolve (Section 6) says we are to assess bay management, but we are also to look at more pressing issues that were presented in specific legislation. Let's look at specific issues in near term and certainly then honor looking at bay management in long term via a long term sitting committee. They would look at a wide range of issues and supporting some pilot projects.

Dow – I second Paul. This should be a recommendation and not specific details. This is a worthwhile idea, but we can tentatively say we'll recommend this. Bay management for me means comprehensive and not just an industry process as we see in Ireland or Cobscook Bay.

Hayden – I would like to spend some time thinking about what this should look like, and not just be a recommendation. I believe there is consensus here that the existing regulatory system is sufficient and does not need to be scrapped. We might be trying to decide too much at this point. I think the lobster zone council is a very applicable model given the variability of aquaculture along the coast.

Quintrell – I think we have consensus on what bay management is, so let's come to a conclusion here. Bay management should be proactive.

Salisbury – We need to give local individuals guidance in how to develop bay management programs, we cannot just give have them working without this.

Fitzgerald – I am not sure there is any way to answer the concerned citizen's feeling of disenfranchisement than enacting bay management. We need to answer the concerns of the people I've been hearing about for the last 4 years.

Hopkins – We need to get beyond the overly legalistic framework of the hearings, which is not a place where you can safely resolve some of these issues. We need a neighborly system to site leases. We need something more open at the front end with less legal advice.

Working consensus opinion of TF on bay management: Regulatory framework is a good start, but needs some work. Some recommendation will be made about bay management, but not a full-blown proposal.

Paul Anderson will write up a strawman for further elaboration on this item.

- 5:15 pm SAP debriefing

Schmanska – To oversimplify from the municipal standpoint, the big problem is how to integrate municipalities into the existing system where they don't usurp the right of the state or in the way of aquaculture.

Belle – The lobster zone council as a model is lobstermen managing themselves. It's not about other users telling lobstermen where they can put their traps. We want this model because it is industry managing itself. I hope that DMR can talk about changes they have made over the two years which I think has eliminated the disenfranchisement to improve communication. Be careful to sort out when disenfranchisement is just someone not getting the decision they wanted. Look at the case studies.

Horne – Echo Belle's comments. Take a look at last year's legislative changes, particularly the scoping sessions. Bay management is tempting and logical, but you are never going to solve the problem with this tool. You will still have the same problems with individual applications, particularly with respect to private interests such as views.

Hamilton – I appreciate the openness of listening to a range of perspectives and taking them seriously. Policy development is often incremental, so your direction in bay management makes sense in taking a step in one direction and taking some time. If you don't do bay management what will you do? If you don't do it, you will need some good explanation why you aren't going that way given the interest.

Fleming – The panelists today really felt the opportunity to speak was important. Keep looking at the fundamental problems and not just some of the individual's particular concerns. Involving people at an early stage is one of the fundamental issues here. Please read our document as we tried to include a lot of examples on bay management.

- 5:30 pm SAP Involvement policy

Discussed and accepted with modification that they have two times a day to check in.

- 7:00 Priorities & Vision

Logistics review for boat trip and start of meetings.

Review of Blaine House Summit on Natural Resources (Inches)

Task Force asked that the link to Spencer Appollonio's paper be treated identically to all other documents posted on the website.

Task Force agreed that they should be represented at the Blaine House Summit on November 16 to introduce them and their work, to be conducted at the Chair's discretion.

Vision statement (Anderson/Fitzgerald)

Reviewed 9/5 draft vision statement (distributed at meeting).

Remove "potentially" (Beal / Salisbury)

Find another word for "maintain" such as "have" or "will" (Beal/Hayden)

Make it more direct and then we can keep it on the back burner throughout our deliberations (Salisbury)

Strike "traditional" so we just resolving use conflicts, or drop conflicts altogether. (Beal)

We need to address the benefits that accrue to all people from the use of public waters (Dow)

Shouldn't we say that health of communities is dependent upon our natural resources (Hopkins / Hayden)

First sentence should deal with aquaculture (Quintrell)

What are the problems that were brought up today which need to addressed?

- Local disenfranchisement
- Context for decision-making missing
- Limited standing for non-aquaculture people and fishermen
- Regional variation not recognized
- No plan for the future
- No limits—making small decisions without regard for the long term impact
- Process too lengthy, confusing and intimidating
- Lack of criteria on visual and aesthetic impacts
- Broader criteria for making siting decisions
- Economic benefit of aquaculture less than not having it in Penn Bay
- Not appropriate notice, need to address when and how
- Notice of lease application could be given much earlier—at the beginning of the application process
- Lease process doesn't allow for enough municipal involvement

Andy Fisk: Need to prioritize these items.

Sebastian Belle: We could come up with a whole other list from the grower's perspective. Do you want us to submit a list?

Jim Salisbury: Trying to put things in categories, that includes grower issues.

Dave Schmanska: After every public input there will be a list. At what point does the TF start to actually work on these things?

Josie: Can we start to put some of these things into an order. We need to start framing these issues, we don't have time to go around in circles. Once we have a structure, then input from SAP will be easier to do. Need to narrow the universe.

Paul: I want staff to walk us through the current process and let us know what has been changed in the last couple of years.

Josie: We need to be on top of the regulatory process before we go to meeting on it. Andy's papers very helpful.

Mary will be present at Blue Hill meeting and can present leasing process in detail.

Jim Salisbury: Our role isn't to answer questions at public hearings, but we should be informed enough to know the context.

Don Perkins: We need to re-read the legislation and call staff if we need help with issues. We need to listen and refine as we go along. Urges structure for public hearings.

Steadman: I'll give you structure tomorrow that you can discuss.

Will: Would like to hear from Andy on what was addressed today and what things have been addressed in the recent statutes.

David Etnier: Use staff papers as a means of focusing on issues.

Van Perry: Are we going to hear from the grower side—they could present all the problems from that side.

Brian Beal: Couldn't that be taken care of with a list of issues from Sebastian

Sebastian: I can do a list, but having real people tell their stories would be more powerful.

Brian Beal: Noted that statements about where people live (referring to statements made by speakers at Mike Briggs hearing) should not be allowed in the hearings.

Eric Horne: Problems and perceptions of problems...need presentation from objective people—Mary and Andy---who have seen the conflicts first hand and have no stake in them.

Jim Dow: Stakeholders can comment on DMR staff presentations.

Jim Salisbury: Need to synthesize issues into categories.

Group agrees to listen for a ½ hour to Andy and Mary tomorrow. With 15 minutes for SAP comments.

Josie: Would like to know what conserved lands issues are with regard to aquaculture.

Chris Hamilton: Yes, there are issues beyond aesthetics and he will make them available to the TF.

Jim Dow: Habitat—who is doing that?

Andy Fisk: Don't know if we can fit that issue in—bird and wildlife habitat.

Brian Beal—Don't know what TF can do about an eagle nest. It's a federal issue.

Andy Fisk: Technically we should study these issues, but time constraints may not allow it.

Josie: If you (staff) feel that this issue is being taken care of adequately, let us know that.

Andy: IF&W can give you their assessment of how their mission to protect wildlife interfaces with aquaculture. We can ask them to provide information on this.

Don Perkins: Thinks staff memos are phenomenal. Extremely valuable.

David Etnier: Use those documents. Stakeholders please respond to us on where we missed the ball, questions, comments you have.

- 9:00 am – 11:00 am Priorities and Tasks for Making Recommendations